

FORM 26. Docketing Statement

Form 26 (p. 1)
July 2020

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

DOCKETING STATEMENT

Case Number: 23-2298, 23-2354

Short Case Caption: VLSI Tech. LLC v. Patent Quality Assurance LLC

Filing Party/Entity: Patent Quality Assurance LLC

Instructions: Complete each section or check the box if a section is intentionally blank or not applicable. Attach additional pages as needed. Refer to the court's Mediation Guidelines for filing requirements. An amended docketing statement is required for each new appeal or cross-appeal consolidated after first filing.

Case Origin	Originating Number	Type of Case
USPTO PTAB	IPR2021-01229	Inter Partes Review

Relief sought on appeal: ☐ None/Not Applicable

Affirm the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's decision that claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 7,523,373 are unpatentable. Vacate all findings and determinations in Papers 35 (other than Part III.A), 36, 37, 39, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 117, 122, 124, 125, 130, 131, 143, and the precedential publication of Paper 102.

Relief awarded below (if damages, specify): ☐ None/Not Applicable

In a Final Written Decision, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board ruled that claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 7,523,373 are unpatentable.

Briefly describe the judgment/order appealed from:

The above-listed orders issued by the Director in this Inter Partes Review, except for Part III.A of Paper 35.

Nature of judgment (select one):

Date of judgment: 6/13/23

☒ Final Judgment, 28 USC § 1295

☐ Rule 54(b)

☐ Interlocutory Order (specify type) _____

☐ Other (explain) _____

FORM 26. Docketing Statement

Form 26 (p. 2)
July 2020

Name and docket number of any related cases pending before this court, and the name of the writing judge if an opinion was issued. ☐ None/Not Applicable

VLSI Technology LLC v. Intel Corporation, No. 22-1906 (Fed. Cir.) (Taranto, J.) (appeal from VLSI Technology LLC v. Intel Corporation, No. 6:21-cv-00057 (W.D. Tex.))

Issues to be raised on appeal: ☐ None/Not Applicable

Whether the Director had authority to issue orders in Papers 35, 39, 100, 101, 102, 106, 112, 130, 131, and 146 and whether the Director legally erred in issuing the same. Whether the Director erred by determining arguments or statements were a misrepresentation or misleading when the underlying document was before the Board and the Board was not misled.

Have there been discussions with other parties relating to settlement of this case?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If "yes," when were the last such discussions?

- ☐ Before the case was filed below
☒ During the pendency of the case below
☐ Following the judgment/order appealed from

If "yes," were the settlement discussions mediated? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If they were mediated, by whom?

Do you believe that this case may be amenable to mediation? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Explain.

The issues are too divergent to be settled by mediation.

Provide any other information relevant to the inclusion of this case in the court's mediation program.

Date: 12/14/23 Signature: s/Truman H. Fenton

Name: Truman H. Fenton